



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/539,193	03/30/2000	Roger K. Brooks	930114.407	8635

500 7590 04/14/2004

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC  
701 FIFTH AVE  
SUITE 6300  
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER
----------

LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 04/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/539,193

Applicant(s)

BROOKS ET AL.

Examiner

Christian La Forgia

Art Unit

2131

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christian La Forgia.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 13 April 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11, 27, 36, 49 and 54.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant gave a brief explanation of the invention of the instant application and how it was different from the cited prior art. The Examiner gave his interpretation of the cited art along with some suggestions as to clarifying the claims. The suggestions the Examiner offered appear to overcome the cited prior art, but would require a further review of the cited art as well as an updated search.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's Signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

**Facsimile Transmission**

(3 pages including this page)

**SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC**

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 6300

Seattle WA 98104-7092 USA

Facsimile: (206) 682-6031

Telephone: (206) 622-4900

www.SeedIP.com

Seed<sup>IP</sup>Dennis M. de Guzman  
dennisd@SeedIP.com

March 16, 2004

**TO:** Examiner Christian A. LaForgia

Fax No.: 703-746-8887

**RE:** U.S Patent Application No. 09/539,193

Our Reference: 930114.407

☒ Urgent☒ For Review☐ Please Confirm  
Receipt☒ Please Reply  
ASAP**Comments:**

Tues 4/13 1PM

If you do not receive all pages, please call  
**Wendy Thomas** at (206) 622-4900  
or fax our office.**Transmission Information:**

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Time \_\_\_\_\_

By \_\_\_\_\_

**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** The information contained in this facsimile message is legally privileged and/or confidential information intended only for the use of the addressee named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution, or copying of this facsimile or its content is strictly prohibited. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original facsimile message to us by mail or destroy it without making a copy. Thank you.

### Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 09/539,193      First Named Applicant: Roger K. Brooks  
 Examiner: Christian A. LaForgia      Art Unit: 2131      Status of Application: Pending/Final Rejection

**Tentative Participants:**

(1) Dennis M. de Guzman (Reg. No. 41,702)      (2) Examiner Christian A. LaForgia  
 From Seed IP Law Group  
 Telephone (206) 622-4900 x310

(3) \_\_\_\_\_      (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: TBD

Proposed Time: TBD (AM/PM)

**Type of Interview Requested:**

(1) ☒ Telephonic      (2) ☐ Personal      (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES      ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

### Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) Rejection	Cl. 1	Lyons (USPN 5,936,968)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) Rejection	Cl. 11, 27	Lyons and Aharoni (USPN 6,014,694)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) Rejection	Cl. 36, 49, 54	Lyons	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

**Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:**

A. Claim 1 recites multiple streams provided by a network gateway, from which one stream can be selected to be displayed. Lyons provides only one stream—not multiple streams (see, e.g., column 3, line 60 and column 4, line 51 of Lyons). Plus, the network gateway makes the selection—the display device does not make the selection (the display device performs the selection in the prior art, as described in the office action).

B. Claims 27, 36, 49, and 54 also recite multiple streams provided by a network gateway or broadcast server, from which one stream can be selected to display. Lyons provides only one stream, and the display device (not the network gateway or broadcast server) selects the stream in the prior art.

C. Claim 11 recites converting the incoming video signal into a plurality of second formats. Lyons only generates a single output stream with one format. Similarly, Aharoni generates only one stream (see, e.g., Figure 8 of Aharoni).

D. These independent claims in their current format are distinctive over the cited prior art based on at least the reasons above. Perhaps claims 1, 27, 36, 49, and 54 can be amended to make it more explicit that the network gateway or broadcast server performs the selection of a stream. Claim 11 can perhaps be

amended to further clarify that the plurality of second formats corresponds to multiple different streams (this feature is inherent or implicit in the claim in its current form), and/or amended to include other recitations from the other independent claims.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_.

**NOTE:**

This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.33(b)) as soon as possible:

 Reg. No.  
41,702

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature)

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is a file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Office, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

*If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.*

465650

19

computer readable program code configured to cause said computer to effect a tiling mechanism configured to create said distributed electronic image by dividing an image into a plurality of tiles, said plurality of tiles being spatially variant and wherein each of said plurality of tiles contains more information than required to render said view on a client system;

computer readable program code configured to cause said computer to effect a network interface for communication with said client system;

computer readable program code configured to cause said computer to effect a first receiving mechanism configured to receive a first tile request for a selected tile from said plurality of tiles over the network interface; and

20

computer readable program code configured to cause said computer to effect a sending mechanism configured to send said selected tile over said network interface to said client system.

38. The computer program product of claim 37 wherein each of said plurality of tiles does not substantially overlap another of said plurality of tiles.

39. The computer program product of claim 37 wherein each of said plurality of tiles substantially overlaps at least one of said plurality of tiles.

40. The computer program product of claim 37 wherein said distributed electronic image is a panoramic image frame.

\* \* \* \* \*